

Supplementary Submission 048.1

Further information requested:

Learn. Earn. Legend! expenditure

Chair: "I had a look, but I could not find how much you actually spend on the Learn Earn Legend! program. Do you have that information?"

Ms Love: Yes. The Learn Earn Legend! initiative is a branding, and it is largely funded under the Indigenous Employment Program. Almost 90 per cent of the expenditure under the Learn Earn Legend! brand is through the Indigenous Employment Program. I have a breakdown by financial years and commitment, et cetera.

Chair: It would be great if you could give that as evidence.

Ms Love: Would you like me to provide that now?

Chair: How about if you drop us a line and break that down. That would be great. If you could do that for me that would be terrific".

LEL! Expenditure

	Total expenditure for financial year 2012-2013 (1 July to 30 November 2012)	Total expenditure for financial year 2011-2012	Total expenditure (from 1 July 2009 to 30 November 2012)
Expenditure	\$3,212,527	\$9,256,534	\$20,487,967

Supplementary Submission 048.1

Funding for initiatives aimed at females

“Chair: To pick up on what the deputy chair is saying, it would be good as well if you could also provide a breakdown about how much of the programs, in dollars and cents, is going towards boys and how much is going towards girls”.

LEL! branded projects attract participation from both males and females. A breakdown of expenditure by gender for all LEL! projects would require a considerable investment of resources. The data below provides a snapshot of the almost even gender split for projects delivered by rugby union and rugby league organisations.

	Male	%	Female	%	Total
Souths	22	59.5	15	40.5	37
NRL Western Sydney	82	51.6	77	48.4	159
NSW Origin Legends	22	55	18	45	40
NSW Rugby Union	21	56.8	16	43.2	37
Titans 2012	104	46.4	120	53.6	224
Cowboys 2012	100	51.5	94	48.5	194
Broncos 2012	66	44.6	82	55.4	148
Northern Pride 2012	24	45.3	29	54.7	53
Queensland Reds 2012	27	73	10	27	37
TOTAL	468	50.4	461	49.6	929

Work Exposure in Government (WEX) initiative

“Ms Love: You might be familiar with the Work Exposure in Government program. This is where 100 kids from communities and cities come into Parliament House and spend a couple of days here and then a couple of days in agencies, exploring opportunities in the Public Service and in government.

Mr Haase: What is that called again?

Ms Love: It is called Work Exposure in Government – WEX, to those of us who know and love it.

Mr Haase: Who runs it?

Ms Love: It is run by our department and it is funded through the Indigenous employment program. It is branded as an LEL, Learn. Earn. Legend!

Chair: Please give us more information about that.”

The Work Exposure in Government (WEX) initiative brings approximately 100 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander senior high school students to Canberra for a week to experience the work of offices of parliamentarians and Australian Public Sector agencies. During this time the participants learn about career options and opportunities.

The initiative is funded through the Indigenous Employment Program.

All parliamentarians and public sector agencies are invited to participate.

In 2012, 99 students, 78 parliamentarians and 32 public sector agencies were involved.

Supplementary Submission 048.1

Sporting Chance Program

Dr STONE: Clearly, we have a big emphasis – with the Clontarf models and other models – on boys' participation, boys' sports. But you tell us about these 'academies', seven girls' academies in WA. Can you tell us more about those? What do they do? How are they succeeding? What are their statistical outcomes? We have had mention that there is one at Gunbalanya and one at Jabiru.

There are seven girls' only academies being operated by Role Models and Leaders Australia in WA. They are located in:

- Perth;
- Kalgoorlie;
- Bunbury;
- Broome;
- Derby;
- Roebourne; and
- Kununurra.

Derby, Roebourne and Kununurra will begin operations in 2013. Role Models and Leaders Australia were successful in securing these locations as part of an open application for funding round conducted in August 2012.

Role Models and Leaders Australia also operate girls' only academies in Darwin, Alice Springs, Jabiru and Gunbalanya in the Northern Territory and Coonamble in New South Wales.

Role Models and Leaders Australia is their trading name and their entity name is Western Australian Association for the Development of Role Models and Leaders Inc.

Role Models and Leaders Australia operate their academies in a similar model to the Clontarf Foundation. Every school that Role Models and Leaders Australia operate an academy at, you will find a Clontarf Foundation boys' only academy.

The key characteristics of a Role Models and Leaders Australia academy are as follows:

- The staff to student ratio is approximately 1:32.
- Contact hours across the Academies vary but as a general rule there are up to seven hours per week direct contact via scheduled times;
- mentoring and support provided by staff throughout the day and before school, at recess, lunch and after school; after school, evening and weekend sports and general activities;
- Each school has its own Academy Room;
- The Academy has access to available school resources such as computing and transport where available.
- Academy program is embedded into the curriculum through designated timetabled sessions and access to the girls before and after school, and at recess and lunch times during each school day.
- The Academy program operates through a mixture of in-school and out-of-school sessions and activities.
- literacy and numeracy support as well as engaging professional tutors
- Assistance with post-school pathways

The average attendance rate of girls' that participate in a Role Models and Leaders Australia academy is 71 per cent with rates ranging from 44 per cent to 88 per cent. The average

Supplementary Submission 048.1

attendance rate of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander girls' that do not participate in their academies is 68 per cent.

The Clontarf Foundation academy participant's average 72 per cent attendance while the cohort of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander boys that do not participate in the academy is 66 per cent.

Dr STONE: How much does DEEWR put into Clontarf?

Over the 2009-13 funding period a total of \$25.5 million has been allocated to the Foundation.

In 2013 alone, the Australian Government has committed \$ 6.4 million to the Clontarf Foundation to operate 40 Sporting Chance Program school-based sports academies across WA, NT, Vic, and NSW.

The Sporting Chance Program school-based sports academy funding model requires the providers to source two thirds of the operating costs of an academy. The Foundation have strong partnerships with State and Territory Governments as well as the corporate community who also contribute funding to their academies.

Dr STONE: Also, when you are providing us with the other information about the girls' academies, could you also provide information on how many federal dollars go into those as well?

Role Models and Leaders Australia are not the only providers who operate girls' only academies. The following girls' only academies will be operating in 2013:

- Stronger Smarter Sisters academy operated by Katherine High School, NT;
- Shalom Sports Academy operated by Shalom College, Townsville QLD;
- Wannik Dance Academy operated by Victorian Education department in region Vic;
- Leroy Loggins Southside Girls' Academy operated by the Leroy Loggins Foundation, Brisbane QLD;
- T4T Gold Coast Academy operated by Titans 4 Tomorrow Ltd in QLD;
- T4T Surat Basin Academy operated by Titans 4 Tomorrow Ltd in QLD; and
- T4T Tweed River Academy operated by Titans 4 Tomorrow Ltd in QLD.

It is also important to note that there are currently 13 co-educational academies operating under the Sporting Chance Program.

A total of \$3 million has been allocated to girls' only academies and a total of \$4.3 million has been allocated to co-educational academies in 2013.

CHAIR: To pick up on what the deputy chair is saying, it would be good as well if you could also provide a breakdown about how much of the programs, in dollars and cents, is going towards boys and how much is going towards girls.

As mentioned above in 2013 a total of \$3 million has been allocated to girls' only academies, \$6.5 million to boys' only academies and \$4.3 million to co-educational academies.

Annual Report data collected at the end of 2012 identified 39 per cent of academy participants are female with 61 per cent being male. This breakdown includes participants of co-educational academies.

Supplementary Submission 048.1

CHAIR: You mentioned that there was an occasional resentment towards one or more of these programs. That was reported and one was identified as an occasional resentment from others in the school community in relation to Sporting Chance Program. Can you elaborate further in relation to that?

An evaluation of the Sporting Chance Program was conducted in 2011. The evaluation measured the extent to which the program was achieving its objective to encourage improved educational outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students.

DEEWR requested that the evaluator identify any unintended consequences of the program both positive and negative. These were included in the report and the evidence for this is mainly anecdotal.

The report stated:

“One unintended consequence mentioned by five schools out of the 87 that took part in the evaluation was some local resistance to the fact that opportunities were being made available disproportionately through the Academy for some students and not others.”

“In two schools there was a concern that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students were being given opportunities not equally available to their non Aboriginal peers. One principal expressed surprise by ‘the extent to which there has been a racist backlash from the community, and resentment in it from students who can’t access [the Academy]’.”

“Project providers, principals and staff were asked if anything had surprised them about the Sporting Chance Program in their school. Twenty-two teachers and principals reported unexpected benefits while six teachers and principals reported being surprised by how quickly benefits could be seen. For example, one principal expressed surprise at ‘how rapidly the program could make a difference and re-engage students who historically may have been at risk’.”

Summary of the evaluation findings on unintended consequences:

There are several unintended consequences (both positive and negative) but the number of schools and providers reporting these is small. The main positive consequence reported is surprise at the level of impact and how quickly students have improved. The main negative consequence is an unintended one of fostering some resentment among other students at apparently disproportionate opportunities being provided.